

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11-18 and 20 are objected to due to informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse since the dependent claims as originally submitted are fully supported by the written description. Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 20020069365 issued to Howard et al. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Howard discloses a limited use browser that downloads data for viewing only [0045].

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser, the protocol decryption engine operable to decrypt the encrypted protocol associated with the HTML link and authorize execution of the associated restricted browser function without the function confirmation.”

Claim 9 recites, in part, “authorizing execution of the restricted function without the distinct confirmation.”

Claim 18 recites, in part, “a protocol decryption engine interfaced with the browser and operable to override the distinct confirmation requirement upon decryption and validation of the encrypted protocol.”

Howard cannot anticipate Claims 1, 9 and 18 because Howard fails to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1, 9 and 18. For example, Howard fails to teach, disclose or suggest “a protocol decryption engine operable to ... authorize execution of the associated restricted browser function without the function confirmation” as recited by Claim 1; “authorizing execution of the restricted function without the distinct confirmation” as recited by Claim 9; or “a protocol decryption engine ... operable to override the distinct confirmation requirement upon decryption and validation of the encrypted protocol.” Howard downloads content so that the content is for viewing only [0045], and thus teaches away from Applicants’ claimed invention which executes a protocol that requires a confirmation without requiring confirmation at the browser. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner

withdraw the rejections to Claims 1, 9 and 18, as well as Claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-20 which depend from Claims 1, 9 and 18 respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on August 24, 2007.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020